

### REMARKS

Claims 61-75 are pending in this application, of which Claims 61, 66 and 71 are in independent form. Claims 61 and 66 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 71-75 have been added to assure Applicants a fuller measure of protection of the scope to which they deem themselves entitled.

Initially, Applicants note that in the first Office Action issued in this application, the Examiner kindly acknowledged having received "a certified copy of foreign document". From this, it is Applicants' understanding that the Office acknowledges having received the certified copies of both priority documents, Japanese Patent Applications 11-045531 and 11-366624, filed on February 23, 1999, and December 24, 1999, respectively. If that is not the case, Applicants respectfully request to be so apprised.

In the Office Action, Claims 61-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,195,077 (Gyouten et al.) in view of U.S. Patents 5,867,593 (Fukuda et al.) and 5,654,607 (Yamaguchi et al.).

Initially, while the language of Claims 61 and 66 has been clarified, it is not intended to change the structure that Applicants are trying to claim.

The general nature of the invention, and the prior art, have been adequately discussed in previous papers, and it is not believed to be necessary to repeat that discussion.

Independent Claim 61 is directed to a display apparatus that comprises a plurality of column wirings each connected to a respective set of display devices, at least one row wiring connected to said display devices, and a respective pulse width modulator

provided for each column wiring for outputting, for each column wiring, a modulation signal having a pulse width determined according to a luminance signal that is to be displayed by a respective one of the display devices. Claim 61 also recites that each pulse width modulator comprises a correction circuit that (1) receives as an input a luminance signal that is to be displayed by the display device corresponding to the column wiring adjacent to that to which that pulse width modulator supplies the modulation signal, (2) compares the luminance signal received as an input with the luminance signal to be displayed by the display device corresponding to the column wiring to which the modulation signal is applied, and (3) corrects the modulation signal to be supplied from the pulse width modulator based on the comparing result, such as to suppress a change in a luminance of the display devices supplied with the modulation signal from the pulse width modulator. Claim 61 further specifies that the change that is suppressed is one that results from deformation of the waveform of the modulation signal caused by a level change of the modulation signal supplied to the adjacent column wiring during a high-level period of the modulation signal from the pulse width modulator.

It is noted that at page 3 of the Official Letter, the Examiner has recognized that “*Gyouten* does not teach correcting the modulation in such a way [as] to ‘suppress an effect or luminance of the display devices supplied with the modulation signal from the pulse width modulator due to waveform modulation of the modulation signal supplied from the pulse modulation by a level change of the modulation signal supplied to the adjacent column wiring’.” The Office Action relies on *Yamaguchi* as teaching “amplitudes of waveforms, which change depending upon luminance of a color image signal, and discloses

a modulating-signal driver (318) applying drive signals to each of the wiring lines in the column direction. See col. 11, lines 31-36, col. 21, lines 18-23 and Fig. 13.”

Applicants submit, however, that even if *Yamaguchi* relates to a structure for pulse-width modulation, that document fails to disclose the recited feature of Claim 61 of suppressing a change in luminance resulting from deformation of the waveform of the modulation signal caused by a level change of the modulation signal supplied to the adjacent column wiring during a high-level period of the modulation signal from the pulse width modulator. Nor is any other of the cited references seen to teach or suggest this result, or suggest that this result would be useful. For at least that reason, Applicants deem that Claim 61 is allowable over the art cited against it.

For similar reasons, Claim 66 and newly added Claim 71 are also believed to be allowable over the art applied against the claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 432884v1